

Application Serial No.: 10/706,317
Attorney Docket No.: 2B07.1-023

Remarks:

In response to the Office Action mailed December 7, 2005, and further to Applicant's previous Response of November 25, 1005, Applicant responds as follows:

- 1) Claims 4 and 13 are withdrawn in response to the requirement of Paragraph 2 of the Office Action. This withdrawal is with traverse, as the inclusion of a biasing spring does not exclude the spring clamp identified in the Office Action of October 28, 2005 as characteristic of what is referred to as "Embodiment 2" or "Embodiment B".
- 2) Applicant elects to continue prosecution of Claims 8-16, which Paragraph 3 of the Office Action appears to identify as "Species (ii)", containing a "lever movably mounted to the pivoting block". This election is with traverse, as Claim 1's "trigger guard pivotally mounted to the pivoting block" refers to the same element of the example embodiment shown in referenced Figs. 6-12 as Claim 8's "lever movably mounted to the pivoting block". As the terminology of the respective claims has substantially overlapping meaning with regard to the depicted embodiment, the Examiner would not be seriously burdened by examination of Claims 1-16 together. MPEP § 803. Claim 8 is believed to be generic to all claims of "Embodiment 2" or "Embodiment B" as defined in the Office Action.

The above remarks are believed to be completely responsive to the requirements presented in the Office Action. Should there be any additional matters to discuss, Applicant kindly requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Bradley K. Groff
Reg. No. 39,695

GARDNER GROFF, P.C.
2018 Powers Ferry Road, Suite 800
Atlanta, Georgia 30339

Tel: (770) 984-2300
Fax: (770) 984-0098